

**From:** Philip DeFreest  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 3:46 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Ms. Abernathy

I write urging you NOT to degrade or relax the rules for broadcast ownership that currently discourage and help prevent media monopolies. America's interests are not served by allowing a few corporate giants to totally control television and radio news.

The changes now being proposed and considered would allow a few corporations to buy and control most or all of the radio and television stations across the country and, in effect, control the news! Many of those now operating large networks or owning a number of media outlets have already demonstrated to us their desire and ability to stifle debate and to allow the presentation of essentially only one point of view. Our democratic society thrives on debate and it is imperative that opportunities abound for the expression of opposing viewpoints in every community across our great nation.

It is imperative that you take a stand to prevent these changes. The American people are becoming more and more dependent upon television and radio news as fewer and fewer options exist for unbiased print news coverage. Many of our nation's communities have only a single newspaper and, unfortunately, there seemingly are no barriers to media conglomerates owning and controlling large numbers of these outlets. You have and should retain the authority to prevent the monopolization of the airwaves.

I ask that you continue the present rules. The potential for abuse by the media conglomerates is too great a risk. Please maintain the current level of regulation.

Thank you

Philip F. DeFreest  
4 Meadow Lane  
Rensselaer, NY 12144

**From:** ScallonSmash466@aol.com  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 3:47 PM  
**Subject:** media consolidation proposal

I oppose the proposal to allow media consolidation scheduled for a June 2 vote. Such a proposal is contrary to the free flow of ideas and debate with which a democracy thrives. The concentration of the power of mass communications in the hands of the enemies of democracy such as Rupert Murdoch (FOX), DISNEY (ABC), GE (NBC) & CBS has only served to stifle debate and reduce journalism to the lowest common denominator. I also call upon Michael Powell to resign his position with the FCC in acknowledgement that he has betrayed the public trust by even suggesting such a contemptable proposal.

**CC:** Mike Powell

**From:** Philip DeFreest  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 3:49 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Mr. Copps

I write urging you NOT to degrade or relax the rules for broadcast ownership that currently discourage and help prevent media monopolies. America's interests are not served by allowing a few corporate giants to totally control television and radio news.

The changes now being proposed and considered would allow a few corporations to buy and control most or all of the radio and television stations across the country and, in effect, control the news! Many of those now operating large networks or owning a number of media outlets have already demonstrated to us their desire and ability to stifle debate and to allow the presentation of essentially only one point of view. Our democratic society thrives on debate and it is imperative that opportunities abound for the expression of opposing viewpoints in every community across our great nation.

It is imperative that you take a stand to prevent these changes. The American people are becoming more and more dependent upon television and radio news as fewer and fewer options exist for unbiased print news coverage. Many of our nation's communities have only a single newspaper and, unfortunately, there seemingly are no barriers to media conglomerates owning and controlling large numbers of these outlets. You have and should retain the authority to prevent the monopolization of the airwaves.

I ask that you continue the present rules. The potential for abuse by the media conglomerates is too great a risk. Please maintain the current level of regulation.

Thank you

Philip F. DeFreest  
4 Meadow Lane  
Rensselaer, NY 12144

From MW12702@aol.com  
To Mike Powell  
cc  
Subject Broadcast ownership rules

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air. The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and the freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,  
Michael S White

From MW12702@aol.com  
To Mike Powell  
cc  
Subject Broadcast ownership rules

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air. The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and the freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Michael S White

**From:** J9  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 3 58 PM  
**Subject:** competition

Ms Commissioner

It you really believe that "The FCC's strategic goal for competition is to support the Nation's economy by ensuring that there is a comprehensive and sound competitive framework for communications services", and that "Such a framework should foster innovation and offer consumers meaningful choice in services" If you really believe this quote from your own web site as I do, then how can allowing any further consolidation of radio, television of newspapers do anything but the opposite?

Mr and Mrs E Goodson  
235 Wetzel Way  
Yreka, California 96997  
joesson@hotmail.com

**From:** Raymond J Kizior  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 4 00 PM  
**Subject:** Don't Relax Broadcast Ownershio Rules

Dear Mr Chairman,

Please don't relax the current broadcast ownership rules To do so  
would in the end restrict diversity of opinions and therefore our free speech

Ray Kizior  
Exeter, RI

**From:** ARTHUR TORGERSEN  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, Commissioner Adelstein, KM  
KJMWEB  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 4 14 PM  
**Subject:** BROADCAST OWNERSHIP RULES-DO NOT RELAX

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. For the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you too continue the broadcast ownership protections.

Sincerely yours,  
Arthur L. Torgersen



**From:** Patricia Dunham  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 4 15 PM  
**Subject:** Re Media Ownership

Commissioner Copps,  
I hope you will do all in your power to stop the loosening of media ownership rules  
Changing the regulations that limit the number of media outlets any corporation can own is a frightening concept, anytime, especially in the current atmosphere of secrecy  
Pat Dunham

**From:** Doug Hirte  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 4 18 PM  
**Subject:** Media Monopolies

Dear Ms Abernathy

I am concerned that the proposed rule change(S) will defeat the present law and applicable rules which serve to prevent media monopolies. If these changes are adopted, independent voices across this Country will be snuffed out by the already huge media corporations.

Whole communities, states and possibly regions could be dominated by one media company which could decide which viewpoints to 'allow' on the air and which to censor.

Media Conglomerates have historically used their power to silence opposing viewpoints. These proposed rule changes would give them far greater power to keep opposing views off the air and out of the newspapers.

Many of the corporations that are fighting for these rule changes-including media giants Viacom/CBS and Disney/ABC-are precisely the very same elitist, leftist, anti-freedom companies that have in the past used their positions and power to silence emerging-opposing views.

Sincerely, Doug Hirte

**From:** jarcp@onebox.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 4:20 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast ownership rules

Dear Ms. Abernathy,

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,  
Ron Reed  
1209 S.W. 129th Street  
Oklahoma City, OK 73170  
405-691-2296  
jarcp@onebox.com - email

**From:** jarcp@onebox.com  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 4 22 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast ownership rules

Dear Mr. Copps,

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,  
Ron Reed  
1209 S W 129th Street  
Oklahoma City, OK 73170  
405-691-2296  
jarcp@onebox.com - email

**From:** Bob Royce  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 4:28 PM  
**Subject:** New Broadcast Ownership Rules

Please do not adopt these rules as they will put huge media corporations in charge of the media and therefore snuff out the independent voices that a democracy depends on. There are too many large corporations dominating too many aspects of American life. Bigger is not better.

Most sincerely,  
Robert S. Royce

**From:** Nancy Jane Kern  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 4 28 PM  
**Subject:** Do not relax broadcast ownership rules

To the Honorable Michael K. Powell

I and my friends and family are very concerned about the proposed "broadcast ownership rules" changes

We do not want to be censored by huge media companies that are able to control what stories are heard by the people of this country. We wish to preserve our ability to air balanced views on various issues.

Thank you for your attention and noting the way to keep us a free America,

Nancy Jane Kern

---

Help STOP SPAM with the new MSN 8 and get 2 months FREE\*

**From:** Larry McFatter  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 4 50 PM  
**Subject:** FCC Decisions

As American citizens who have turned increasingly to the BBC and other news outlets in order to get a broader perspective on the Iraq invasion, the Mid-East crisis and many other issues, we want the FCC to know that we do NOT want the control of the media in the hands of a few, such as Clear Channel. Our country has been able to survive because the ordinary citizenry could access news, opinions, and analysis from a variety of voices. We are adamantly opposed to media megaliths controlling print, t v and radio, thus limiting even further the information we need to be educated citizens.

We urge the FCC NOT to relax the standing restraints on media ownership and control.

Sincerely,  
Deborah McFatter  
Larry McFatter

May 3, 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street SW  
Washington, DC 20554

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of the radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protection that, for decades, have helped ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Best regards,  
David R. Clark  
Plymouth, MA 02360





**From:** STEPHEN J PICKERING  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 5 12 PM  
**Subject:** <No Subject>

Dear Ms Abernathy

I urge you "not" to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades have helped to insure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely

Mr. Stephen Pickering  
Winooski, Vermont 05404

**From:** fredmarion  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 5 18 PM  
**Subject:** Media Ownership Rules

Dear M Powell et al

I am an individual American who values her democracy and desires to have a variety of sources of information. I understand that there will be a meeting at the FCC on 6/2 to determine whether or not the media ownership restriction rules should be eased or eliminated.

I urge you and the rest of the FCC making the decision NOT to ease these rules and, in fact, believe they should be tightened in some cases.

Our Democracy is dependent upon the public being able to hear dissenting positions on issues, and recent media coverage should bring home most clearly that information is being controlled by the limited number of outlets. I also bring your attention to ENRON, which spearheaded deregulation of the energy markets, resulting in many consumers being gouged on energy costs and we know the rest of the story.

I, for one, don't wish to see programming that is selected based on the bottom line or the political positions of the few moguls owning media outlets. Remember, these outlets are supposed to be owned by the Public. That's us.

Sincerely,  
Marion Slater  
Apollo Beach, FL

**From:** George Andrews  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 5 22 PM  
**Subject:** Consolidation of Media Ownership

TO: FCC Chairman, Michael K. Powell  
mpowell@fcc.gov

Copies To: Schiff, Boxer, Feinstein, Commissioners Abernathy, Copps, Martin, & Adelstein, Members of the Senate Subcommittee on Communications

Dear Sir,

I am outraged that the FCC seems to be about to ram through rule changes affecting media concentration without adequate time for commissioners or the public to study the proposal. What is the hurry? Is there a hidden agenda YOU do not want to be publicly scrutinized??? I hope not!

The commission and its people - YOU - are supposed to be the people's representative in matters affecting this publicly owned resource, the airwaves! I don't care one wit about whether you believe you have a legal or administrative right to skip public debate. I expect you to fulfill your obligation to the public to actually represent us. The only way you can legitimately do that is by listening to us. The only way we can meaningfully speak is to first know the issues, and have time to consider them. I expect you to fulfill your obligations to us, the public.

There is absolutely no chance that I would accept that issues of media consolidation can be considered a minor administrative matter! It is a MAJOR matter!!! If the commission - if YOU - hurry and push through rules changes, and then we later find out it was a mistake, correcting it will be very difficult (AFTER the consolidation has occurred!). What is YOUR hurry? Why are YOU doing this, when there is no legitimate need to hurry????

I wish to make my voice heard. I do not want further consolidation of TV or any media. In fact, I want consolidation to be reduced! Many people that I know personally have noticed (as have I) the degradation of TV. The more consolidation that has occurred, the worse it has gotten. News isn't news anymore - it is agendized propaganda, sensationalism, voyeurism, entertainment, and commercialism. Entertainment programs seem to be written by 11 to 13 year old boys, pandering to the basest of human desires and to voyeurism (NOTE: I taught this age group!). I have 3 under-age granddaughters. They should not be exposed to the trash now on TV.

If TV had freer access by independent producers, it very likely wouldn't make matters worse, and very likely would produce more diversity. The market place would then function as it should.

Make no mistake. The matter of our very freedom as a people is at stake here. Consolidation of the means of mass communications greatly heightens the possibility of special interests manipulating public opinion, so as to achieve a private agenda. That could be a political party, the party in office, a commercial agenda, or a social engineering

agenda (Whoever the owners happen to support!) A lot of that is going on now It is quite obvious! IT IS QUITE OUTRAGEOUS! For us to remain a powerful and just nation, it is absolutely mandatory that we have a free press, and TV is the major part of the press today I dont want the press to be controlled by any entity or small group, be it a part of government, a politically agendized group, or commercial interest!

As I see it, there would be absolutely NO benefit TO THE PUBLIC to allow consolidation to increase The only groups that COULD benefit would do so AT THE PUBLICS EXPENSE!

Please do YOUR DUTY, as the public perceives it to be Go slow Inform the public Allow the public (and the commissioners) time to digest, to respond, and to debate the responses

Thank you,  
George Andrews

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** virginia HUBER  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 5 25 PM  
**Subject:** Preserve Diversity and Media Ownership Limits - DO NOT Remove Remaining Regulatory Limits on Corporations

virginia HUBER  
1790 SIDNEY AV BLD1,APT202  
PORT ORCHARD,, WA 98366

May 3, 2003

FCC Commissioner Michael Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street , SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear FCC Commissioner Copps

The FCC must NOT further weaken the rules that help preserve competition and diversity among the owners of American media

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry. Corporate control limits investigative journalism and responsibility. Our journalists deserve to pursue topics that affect the very existence of what we hope will remain "democracy."

The FCC is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal of or further modification to these rules will likely open the door to more mergers that will continue to reduce competition and diversity in the media. If the rules are weakened further, one company in a city could control the most popular newspaper, TV station and possibly the cable system, giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of news and information. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in this country. Media ownership would be concentrated by corporate monopolies even further, and the public's ability to have open, informed discussion with diverse viewpoints would be compromised.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate the negative effects media deregulation and consolidation have had on media diversity. While there may be indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become more limited.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge, our ability to have open, informed

discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership rules in question in this proceeding

I think it is important for the FCC to not only consider the points of view of those with a financial interest in this issue, but also those with a social or civic interest

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is incumbent on the Commission to take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process

Sincerely,

Virginia Rollo Huber

**From:** lberky@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 5:31 PM  
**Subject:** broadcast ownership rules

Please do not relax the broadcast ownership rules as we need them to protect us from media monopolies. If you relax these rules, the media conglomerates will only air their points of view. That way we will only hear one side of the issues and only what they want us to hear. We deserve to hear all points of view regardless of whether the owners approve of the views or not. We need a healthy political debate on all the issues.

Ivan Berkshire  
Oklahoma City, OK  
73108-5603

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy



**From:** Rosalie Gillmore  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 5:32 PM  
**Subject:** June 2, 2003 vote

Dear Commissioner Abernathy

I would like to express my concern about Commission Chairman Powell's decision to call a vote on June 2, 2003, to change the rules of the current Communications Act that was enacted in the 1930's. The rules provided in that Act work very well in today's advanced age of telecommunications and the need for more competition - not less - is imperative where freedom of speech is concerned. Chairman Powell speaks of competition in the new age of telecommunications. I agree. Why hasn't he encouraged the major TV and radio networks and the Internet providers to report this major news item that the FCC plans to vote on June 2, 2003, to change the current Communications Act and his reasons why it should be changed?

Before a decision to change the Communications Act is made, a thorough discussion between the public and the FCC should be held and that has not happened because the public has not been fully informed about the changes proposed by the FCC. More time for discussion is needed before a vote is taken.

The major television stations that present the news, the major newspapers around the country, the Internet, all the radio stations broadcasting in the U.S. and the FCC directors must inform the public of the major changes proposed before a vote is taken.

The U.S. government in the 1930's was aware of freedom of speech and competition in the workplace as is the U.S. government of 2003. After all, our Constitution was written over 200 years ago and no one is criticizing it! It worked then and it works now. In the early days of TV there was quality programming - as well as poor programming - and the public had choices. Now the only choice for decent programming is on Public Broadcasting Stations so we pay for that as well as cable TV. Radio is abominable because a few large corporations are buying radio markets across the country and there is little if any objective broadcasting. The same is happening in TV news. What needs changing is that large corporations should not have a monopoly in all areas of the media.

Please extend the vote to change the Communications Act until the public has had time to digest the changes proposed. Thank you for your attention.

Rosalie Gillmore      Gillmore\_R@msn.com

**From:** Rob Speer  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 5 42 PM  
**Subject:** media ownership

Please do not lift the present caps on media ownership. You do not realize the implications of such a move. We're talking about potential state-controlled media. I and my colleagues strongly protest this resolution. If you care at all about preserving the integrity of this country, PLEASE DO NOT remove the current restrictions to media ownership. Rob Speer

Rob

**From:** robert1924@juno.com  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 5:45 PM  
**Subject:** Do not open the door to media control by a few

Mr. Powell

I understand that on June 2 there will be a vote on recommendations to change the current restrictions on ownership of media organizations in the direction of allowing concentration of ownership. THIS IS A MISTAKE! Do not change the code in that direction!

For the sake of good media and good news coverage, do not allow this concentration to happen!

Dr. Robert M. Elliott, 1117 Lombardy Road, Oklahoma City, OK 73118

**From:** robert1924@juno.com  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 5:45 PM  
**Subject:** Keeping our media more open

Dear Michael Copps

I understand that on June 2, a vote will be taken that could permit the concentration of our media units into fewer hands. PLEASE DO NOT VOTE FOR THIS TO HAPPEN!

Keep our media ownership more diverse so that our democracy can be open and can flourish

Dr. Robert M. Elliott, 1117 Lombardy Road, Oklahoma City, OK 73118

**From:** robert1924@juno.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 5:45 PM  
**Subject:** Change of current code

Dear Kathleen Abernathy

I understand that on June 2, there will be a vote to lessen restriction on media ownerships. DO NOT DO THIS! Concentration of ownership will do great harm to us in a number of ways! Keep media units in the hands of more folk so that democracy can function!

Dr. Robert M. Elliott, 1117 Lombardy Road, Oklahoma City, OK 73118

**From:** robert1924@juno.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sat, May 3, 2003 5:45 PM  
**Subject:** Jonathan, don't take us down the wrong path

Dear Mr. Adelstein,

If June 2 is to see a vote on the change of regulations for media organizations ownership? DO NOT VOTE TO LET GREATER CONCENTRATION OF OWNERSHIP HAPPEN! This would be terribly destructive to democracy. WE have too great a concentration already and it has cost us good news coverage. DON'T MAKE IT WORSE!

Dr. Robert M. Elliott, 1117 Lombardy Road, Oklahoma City, OK 73118